



Land Development
Review Division
(619) 446-5460

Negative Declaration

Project No. 34566

SUBJECT: **Sprint Twin Trails**. Neighborhood Use Permit (NUP) to install, operate, and maintain a wireless communication facility consisting of three panel-antennas on an existing traffic signal/light standard located at the southeast corner of Carmel Mountain Road and Twin Trails Drive. The associated equipment (placed within a subterranean vault) and the above-ground meter (strong box) would be located on the northeast corner of the same intersection. The proposed facility would be located within the public right-of-way and is adjacent to Residential (RS-1-7) zoning within the Rancho Peñasquitos community planning area. Applicant: Sprint Telephony, PCS L.P.

I. PROJECT DESCRIPTION: See attached Initial Study.

II. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING: See attached Initial Study.

III. DETERMINATION:

The City of San Diego has conducted an Initial Study and determined that the proposed project will not have a significant environmental effect and the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report will not be required.

IV. DOCUMENTATION:

The attached Initial Study documents the reasons to support the above Determination.

V. MITIGATION, MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM: None required.

VI. PUBLIC REVIEW DISTRIBUTION:

Draft copies or notice of this Negative Declaration were distributed to:

City of San Diego

Councilmember Peters, District 1

Library (81)

Others

Rancho Peñasquitos Community Council (378)

Rancho Peñasquitos Planning Board (380)

Gary Akin, SDG&E (381)

Rancho Penasquitos Town Council (383)

VII. RESULTS OF PUBLIC REVIEW:

() No comments were received during the public input period.

- () Comments were received but did not address the draft Negative Declaration finding or the accuracy/completeness of the Initial Study. No response is necessary. The letters are attached.
- () Comments addressing the findings of the draft Negative Declaration and/or accuracy or completeness of the Initial Study were received during the public input period. The letters and responses follow.

Copies of the draft Negative Declaration and any Initial Study material are available in the office of the Land Development Review Division for review, or for purchase at the cost of reproduction.

Terri Bumgardner, Senior Planner
Development Services Department

March 30, 2005
Date of Draft Report

Analyst: JARQUE

Date of Final Report

City of San Diego
DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT
Land Development Review Division
1222 First Avenue, Mail Station 501
San Diego, CA 92101
(619) 446-5460

INITIAL STUDY

Project No. 34566

SUBJECT: **Sprint Twin Trails.** Neighborhood Use Permit (NUP) to install, operate, and maintain a wireless communication facility consisting of three panel-antennas on an existing traffic signal/light standard located at the southeast corner of Carmel Mountain Road and Twin Trails Drive. The associated equipment (placed within a subterranean vault) and the above-ground meter (strong box) would be located on the northeast corner of the same intersection. The proposed facility would be located within the public right-of-way and is adjacent to Residential (RS-1-7) zoning within the Rancho Peñasquitos community planning area. Applicant: Sprint Telephony, PCS L.P.

I. PURPOSE AND MAIN FEATURES:

The proposed project and Neighborhood Use Permit (NUP), to be considered by Development Services Department Project Manager (PROCESS 2), would allow the installation, operation, and maintenance of an unmanned wireless communication facility. The facility would be located at the intersection of Carmel Mountain Road and Twin Trails Drive within the Rancho Peñasquitos community planning area. (Figure 1)

The project would be wireless telecommunication (telecom) facility consisting of Base Telephone System (BTS) equipment and three panel-antennas that would be mounted to a new 30-foot traffic/light pole within the public right-of-way. Associated equipment would be operated inside an underground 61.75-square-foot vault located along the north side of Carmel Mountain Road. Two above ground air-flow vents to the vault would be 3 feet in height. An above ground meter located in a strongbox cabinet would be approximately four-feet, six-inches in height, two feet in length, and painted dark green in color. Conduits for the proposed wireless facility would be routed internally within the traffic light pole and then run east along Carmel Mountain Road then north within the public right-of-way and connect with the associate vault and strongbox. (Figure 2)

The project proposes minimum grading to excavate, construct, and place associated conduits, strong box, vault, and new light standard within the public right-of-way. The vault, strongbox, and vents would be screened with proposed five-gallon Natal Plum (*Carissa grandiflora*) trees and landscaping maintained by Sprint PCS.

II. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING:

The project site is located on the intersection of Carmel Mountain Road and Twin Trails Drive, between Sparren Avenue and Sundance Avenue, within the Rancho Peñasquitos community planning area. The proposed antennas, vault, and strong box is located within the public right-of-way that is adjacent to zoned RS-1-7 (Residential) and identified as Residential (Very Low Density (0-1 dwelling units per acre (du/ac)) per the Rancho Penasquitos Community Plan. The surrounding area to the north, east, south, and west are

also zoned RS-1-7 (Residential) and identified as Residential (Very Low Density 0-1 dwelling units per acre (du/ac)).

The site is entirely within the developed public right-of-way. The existing traffic signal/street light on the southeast corner of Carmel Mountain Road will be replaced with a new 30-foot high street light with three panel-antennas mounted and painted gray to match pole. The strongbox (meter) and underground (equipment) vault is located within the public right-of-way along the sidewalk. (Figure 3) The proposed project is not mapped in or adjacent to the City's Multiple Habitat Planning Area (MHPA).

III. ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS: See attached Initial Study checklist.

IV. DISCUSSION:

The following environmental issues were considered during the initial study and determined to be below a level of significance, therefore no mitigation would be required.

Human Health and Safety

Perceived health hazards are those that members of the general public and/or the scientific community believe to exist, or potentially exist, but have not been substantiated. The presence of radio frequency emissions from communication facilities could be considered a highly controversial perceived health hazard.

On February 8, 1996, the Telecommunications Act of 1996 was signed into law. Section 740 of the act states as follows: "No state or local government or instrumentality thereof may regulate the placement, construction, and modification of wireless service facilities on the basis of the environmental effects of radio frequency emissions to the extent that such facilities comply with the commission's regulations concerning such emissions." The following information is included for public disclosure purposes only.

Communications antennas emit varying levels of radio frequency (RF) energy. Below a certain threshold of RF power there is virtually no danger at any distance or direction from the transmitting antenna. Above that threshold, the installation is generally designed to ensure that the areas in which people are likely to be found are exposed to a minimum and safe level of RF energy. The American National Standards Institute (ANSI), and the Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers (IEEE) have established the standard for safe exposure levels of RF energy for wireless facilities. Radio frequency (also known as electromagnetic frequency) emission levels are usually expressed and measured as a "power density" which is described in terms of power per unit area. This would be the power which flows outward from the transmitter and passes through a given area. Because the intensity of radiation diminishes at greater distances from the source, the exposure, even within the "beam," is reduced, and at sufficient distance presents no exposure danger.

The accepted standard for safe exposure to RF energy from the proposed type of facility is 580 microwatts per square centimeter ($\mu\text{W}/\text{cm}^2$). The exposure level associated with most cellular facilities is about 0.01% of the accepted standard, or $5.8 \mu\text{W}/\text{cm}^2$ at 50 feet, which would be below the established safety level. Therefore no significant impact to human health has been identified and no mitigation would be required.

Noise

The proposed underground equipment vault may contain electronic cooling (air conditioning) equipment that may emit noise from the above-ground air vents. A project which would generate noise levels at the property line which exceeds the City's Noise Ordinance could be considered potentially significant. Since the proposed location of the vault is adjacent to single-family residences (sensitive receptors) and within an area that is zoned RS-1-7 (Residential), a noise report was required to determine if the standard equipment proposed would create an audible noise that exceeds the City's Noise Abatement and Control Ordinance, as described in Section 59.5.0401 of the City's Municipal Code.

Based on the underlying zone, significant noise impacts to surrounding single-family residential uses would be considered significant if the equipment would exceed 50 dB(A) L_{eq} during daytime hours (7:00 AM to 7:00 PM); 45 dB(A) L_{eq} during early evening hours (7:00 PM to 10:00 PM); and 40 dB(A) L_{eq} during late evening hours (10:00 PM to 7:00 AM).

A Noise Planning for Sprint PCS ROW Vault Containment System (Eilar Associates, February 15, 2005) was submitted to identify and disclose potential impacts. The report, which is available for public review at the offices of the Land Development Review Division, disclosed that the electronic equipment in the vault would be cooled by an eight-inch muffin fan within the vault.

Noise measurements were taken at two similar operational Sprint facilities. The results concluded that with a 3-foot silencer installed on the air exhaust PVC pipe, audible noise levels would be below the targeted noise limit of 40 dB at a distance of six feet from the vault. In addition, given the project location along Carmel Mountain Road, traffic noise levels on-site would contribute to the ambient noise levels. The report concluded that standard equipment with proposed air-exhaust silencer installed would not exceed the City Noise Abatement and Control Ordinance and therefore no mitigation would be required.

Geology/Soils

The project is located in a seismically active region of California and, therefore, the potential exists for geologic hazards, such as earthquakes and ground failure to affect the proposed development. According to the City of San Diego Seismic Safety Study, the site is mapped within Geologic Hazard Category 52 (Other level areas, gently sloping to steep terrain, favorable geologic structure, low risk). The project does not include any habitable structures and would be located within the developed public right-of-way. Staff did not identify any faults to have been mapped on or in close proximity to the site (City of San Diego 1974) that may preclude development of the project. The project would not have the potential to increase the exposure of geologic hazards to the public, therefore, any geologic impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation would be required.

V. RECOMMENDATION:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

 X The proposed project would not have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION should be prepared.

 Although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described in

Section IV above have been added to the project. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION should be prepared.

— The proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT should be required.

PROJECT ANALYST: Jarque

Attachments: Figure 1 - Location Map
 Figure 2 - Site Plan
 Figure 3 - Equipment Elevation and Detail
 Initial Study Checklist

Initial Study ChecklistDate: January 14, 2005Project No.: 35438Project Name: Sprint Saturn**I. ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS:**

The purpose of the Initial Study is to identify the potential for significant environmental impacts which could be associated with a project pursuant to Section 15063 of the State CEQA Guidelines. In addition, the Initial Study provides the lead agency with information which forms the basis for deciding whether to prepare an Environmental Impact Report, Negative Declaration, or Mitigated Negative Declaration. This checklist provides a means to facilitate an early environmental assessment. However, subsequent to this preliminary review, modifications to the project may mitigate adverse impacts. All answers of "yes" and "maybe" indicate that there is a potential for significant environmental impacts and these determinations are explained in Section IV of the Initial Study.

Yes Maybe No

A. AESTHETICS / NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER

Will the proposal result in:

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|
| 1. The obstruction of any vista or scenic view from a public viewing area?
<i>The proposed telecommunications structures would be located in the public right-of-way on a traffic/street light that would be replaced. No public views will be obstructed. The project is not in a designated vista or scenic view area identified in an adopted community plan.</i> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> X </u> |
| 2. The creation of a negative aesthetic site or project?
<i>Telecommunication structures would be painted to blend with surrounding environment (landscaped area and traffic light pole).</i> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> X </u> |
| 3. Project bulk, scale, materials, or style which would be incompatible with surrounding development?
<i>See A.2.</i> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> X </u> |
| 4. Substantial alteration to the existing character of the area?
<i>See A-2.</i> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> X </u> |
| 5. The loss of any distinctive or landmark tree(s), or a stand of mature trees?
<i>No such resources exist on-site.</i> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> X </u> |
| 6. Substantial change in topography or ground surface relief features? | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> X </u> |

The proposed project would be constructed within the developed public right-of-way.

- | | | | | |
|----|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|----------|
| 7. | The loss, covering or modification of any unique geologic or physical features such as a natural canyon, sandstone bluff, rock outcrop, or hillside with a slope in excess of 25 percent?
<i>No such resources exist on-site.</i> | — | — | <u>X</u> |
| 8. | Substantial light or glare?
<i>Telecommunication structures would be painted to blend with surrounding environment (landscaped area and traffic light pole) and would not likely produce a substantial amount of light or glare.</i> | — | — | <u>X</u> |
| 9. | Substantial shading of other properties?
<i>The proposed structures would not substantially shade adjacent properties.</i> | — | — | <u>X</u> |

B. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES / NATURAL RESOURCES / MINERAL RESOURCES
Would the proposal result in:

- | | | | | |
|----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|----------|
| 1. | The loss of availability of a known mineral resource (e.g., sand or gravel) that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?
<i>No such resources exist on-site.</i> | — | — | <u>X</u> |
| 2. | The conversion of agricultural land to nonagricultural use or impairment of the agricultural productivity of agricultural land?
<i>See B.1.</i> | — | — | <u>X</u> |

C. AIR QUALITY
Would the proposal:

- | | | | | |
|----|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|----------|
| 1. | Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?
<i>Telecommunication project would not likely conflict with any air quality plans or standards. The project would not establish a new air emission source.</i> | — | — | <u>X</u> |
| 2. | Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?
<i>See C.1.</i> | — | — | <u>X</u> |
| 3. | Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? | — | — | <u>X</u> |

See C.1. Project would not generate air pollutants.

- | | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|--------------|
| 4. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?
<i>Telecommunication facility would not likely create objectionable odors. The project would not establish a new air emission source.</i> | — | — | — <u>X</u> — |
| 5. Exceed 100 pounds per day of Particulate Matter 10 (dust)?
<i>Project construction may temporarily create particulate matter (dust) but would not significantly exceed threshold.</i> | — | — | — <u>X</u> — |
| 6. Alter air movement in the area of the project?
<i>Telecommunication facility would not likely alter the air movement.</i> | — | — | — <u>X</u> — |
| 7. Cause a substantial alteration in moisture, or temperature, or any change in climate, either locally or regionally?
<i>Proposed development would not affect or change the climate.</i> | — | — | — <u>X</u> — |

D. BIOLOGY

Would the proposal result in:

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|--------------|
| 1. A reduction in the number of any unique, rare, endangered, sensitive, or fully protected species of plants or animals?
<i>No such resources have been identified on-site.</i> | — | — | — <u>X</u> — |
| 2. A substantial change in the diversity of any species of animals or plants?
<i>See D.1.</i> | — | — | — <u>X</u> — |
| 3. Introduction of invasive species of plants into the area?
<i>The project would comply with the City's Landscape Standards.</i> | — | — | — <u>X</u> — |
| 4. Interference with the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors?
<i>See D.1.</i> | — | — | — <u>X</u> — |
| 5. An impact to a sensitive habitat, including, but not limited to streamside vegetation, aquatic, riparian, oak woodland, coastal sage scrub or chaparral?
<i>See D.1.</i> | — | — | — <u>X</u> — |

6. An impact on City, State, or federally regulated wetlands (including, but not limited to, coastal salt marsh, vernal pool, lagoon, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption or other means? <i>No such resources have been identified on-site.</i>	—	—	— <u>X</u> —
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---	---	--------------

7. Conflict with the provisions of the City's Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) Subarea Plan or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan? <i>The project site is not located in or adjacent to the City's Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA).</i>	—	—	— <u>X</u> —
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---	---	--------------

E. ENERGY

Would the proposal:

1. Result in the use of excessive amounts of fuel or energy (e.g. natural gas)? <i>Telecommunication facility would receive power from existing electrical and telephone connection sources. Operation of the telecommunication facility would consume some power, but not in excessive amounts.</i>	—	—	— <u>X</u> —
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---	---	--------------

2. Result in the use of excessive amounts of power? <i>See E.1.</i>	—	—	— <u>X</u> —
------------------------------------------------------------------------	---	---	--------------

F. GEOLOGY/SOILS

Would the proposal:

1. Expose people or property to geologic hazards such as earthquakes, landslides, mudslides, ground failure, or similar hazards? <i>The project site is located in an area that is mapped with Geologic Hazard Ratings of 52 (Other level areas, gently sloping to steep terrain, favorable geologic structure, low risk.) The project would not likely increase the risk or exposure of persons to geologic hazards. See Initial Study Geology discussion.</i>	—	—	— <u>X</u> —
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---	---	--------------

2. Result in a substantial increase in wind or water erosion of soils, either on or off the site? <i>Minimal construction grading would be required for project development.</i>	—	—	— <u>X</u> —
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---	---	--------------

3. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or that would become unstable as	—	—	— <u>X</u> —
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---	---	--------------

a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

See F-1.

— — X

G. HISTORICAL RESOURCES

Would the proposal result in:

1. Alteration of or the destruction of a prehistoric or historic archaeological site?

No such resources are identified.

— — X

2. Adverse physical or aesthetic effects to a prehistoric or historic building, structure, object, or site?

See G.1.

— — X

3. Adverse physical or aesthetic effects to an architecturally significant building, structure, or object?

See G.1.

— — X

4. Any impact to existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?

No such uses exist on-site.

— — X

5. The disturbance of any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

See G.1.

— — X

H. HUMAN HEALTH / PUBLIC SAFETY / HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the proposal:

1. Create any known health hazard (excluding mental health)?

Communications antennas emit varying levels of radio frequency (RF) energy. Perceived health hazards are those that members of the general public and/or the scientific community believe to exist, or potentially exist, but have not been substantiated. The presence of radio frequency emissions from communication facilities could be considered a highly controversial perceived health hazard. The proposed project would be located within the public right-of-way. Surrounding residential development would be buffered by considerable vertical and horizontal distance from antennas. Refer to Human Health and Safety Initial Study discussion.

— — X

- | | | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|--------------|
| 2. Expose people or the environment to a significant hazard through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials?
<i>The project scope does not include storage or transport of unusual hazardous materials. Therefore, no such impact would occur.</i> | — | — | <u> X </u> |
| 3. Create a future risk of an explosion or the release of hazardous substances (including but not limited to gas, oil, pesticides, chemicals, radiation, or explosives)?
<i>No future risk is associated with the project.</i> | — | — | <u> X </u> |
| 4. Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

<i>No such interference with the emergency plans will result from the implementation of this project.</i> | — | — | <u> X </u> |
| 5. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, create a significant hazard to the public or environment?
<i>The project site is not identified on such a list mentioned above. No former release sites appear to be located near the project location.</i> | — | — | <u> X </u> |
| 6. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?
<i>See H-1. The project would not result in any unusual accident scenario affecting public health and safety.</i> | — | — | <u> X </u> |

I. HYDROLOGY/WATER QUALITY

Would the proposal result in:

- | | | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|--------------|
| 1. An increase in pollutant discharges, including down stream sedimentation, to receiving waters during or following construction? Consider water quality parameters such as temperature dissolved oxygen, turbidity and other typical storm water pollutants.
<i>Construction grading would include implementing best management practices (BMPs) necessary to comply with City grading standards to control erosion and prevent pollutant discharge.</i> | — | — | <u> X </u> |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|--------------|

- | | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|---|
| 2. An increase in impervious surfaces and associated increased runoff?
<i>See I.1.</i> | — | — | X |
| 3. Substantial alteration to on- and off-site drainage patterns due to changes in runoff flow rates or volumes?
<i>See I.1.</i> | — | — | X |
| 4. Discharge of identified pollutants to an already impaired water body (as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(b) list)?
<i>See I.1.</i> | — | — | X |
| 5. A potentially significant adverse impact on ground water quality?
<i>See I.1.</i> | — | — | X |
| 6. Cause or contribute to exceeding applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses?
<i>See I.1.</i> | — | — | X |

J. LAND USE

Would the proposal result in:

- | | | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|---|
| 1. A land use which is inconsistent with the adopted community plan land use designation for the site or conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over a project?
<i>The proposed project would not be in conflict with an adopted plan. As a non-residential use, the cellular facility should preferably be located within a non-residentially designated area where possible. Project siting based on land use alone, that does not result in a secondary environmental impact, would not be considered significant under CEQA.</i> | — | — | X |
| 2. A conflict with the goals, objectives and recommendations of the community plan in which it is located?
<i>See J.1.</i> | — | — | X |
| 3. A conflict with adopted environmental plans, including applicable habitat conservation plans adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect for the area?
<i>See J.1.</i> | — | — | X |

- | | | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|----------|
| 4. Physically divide an established community?
<i>See J.1.</i> | — | — | <u>X</u> |
| 5. Land uses which are not compatible with aircraft accident potential as defined by an adopted airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP)? | — | — | <u>X</u> |
| <i>The site is not identified in or affected by any identified zones within a CLUP.</i> | | | |

K. NOISE

Would the proposal result in:

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|----------|
| 1. A significant increase in the existing ambient noise levels?
<i>Wireless communication facility would not likely increase ambient noise levels. Equipment specification within the underground equipment vault may contain 8-inch muffin cooling fans for internal ventilation. The fan may emit an audible noise heard from the air flow pipes and vault door. An air exhaust silencer would be installed to attenuate fan noise within the vault. In addition City staff conducted a site visit to a similar wireless facility and concluded that a "fan" noise could be heard from the air vents, but was not excessive to the ambient residential noise levels. The City standard threshold for residential uses allow noise levels to not exceed 65 dB CNEL. Therefore, no significant noise impacts and/or exceedance of adopted noise levels would result from the proposed wireless facility and equipment vault. See Initial Study Noise discussion.</i> | — | — | <u>X</u> |
| 2. Exposure of people to noise levels which exceed the City's adopted noise ordinance?
<i>See K-1.</i> | — | — | <u>X</u> |
| 3. Exposure of people to current or future transportation noise levels which exceed standards established in the Transportation Element of the General Plan or an adopted airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan?
<i>See K-1.</i> | — | — | <u>X</u> |

L. PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the proposal impact a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

- | | | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|----------|
| <i>Minimum grading would be required to install the new street light and underground vault/strongbox which would not meet and/or exceed thresholds to discover paleontological resources (excavation depths greater than 10 feet within a high sensitivity rated formation). Therefore, the underlying soil formations and</i> | — | — | <u>X</u> |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|----------|

project grading would preclude significant impacts to find paleontological resources.

M. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the proposal:

- | | | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|--------------|
| 1. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?
<i>Wireless communication facility would not likely induce substantial population growth to the area.</i> | — | — | <u> X </u> |
| 2. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?
<i>See M.1.</i> | — | — | <u> X </u> |
| 3. Alter the planned location, distribution, density or growth rate of the population of an area?
<i>See M.1.</i> | — | — | <u> X </u> |

N. PUBLIC SERVICES

Would the proposal have an effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered governmental services in any of the following areas:

- | | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|--------------|
| 1. Fire protection?
<i>Services in the area are adequate for the proposed development. No additional services would be required.</i> | — | — | <u> X </u> |
| 2. Police protection?
<i>See N.1.</i> | — | — | <u> X </u> |
| 3. Schools?
<i>See N.1.</i> | — | — | <u> X </u> |
| 4. Parks or other recreational facilities?
<i>See N.1.</i> | — | — | <u> X </u> |
| 5. Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?
<i>See N.1.</i> | — | — | <u> X </u> |
| 6. Other governmental services?
<i>See N.1.</i> | — | — | <u> X </u> |

O. RECREATIONAL RESOURCES

Would the proposal result in:

- | | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|----------|
| 1. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?
<i>The project would not be required to provide additional parks for the community.</i> | — | — | <u>X</u> |
| 2. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?
<i>See O.1.</i> | — | — | <u>X</u> |

P. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION

Would the proposal result in:

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|----------|
| 1. Traffic generation in excess of specific/community plan allocation?
<i>No substantial increase in traffic generation is expected from the proposed communication facility.</i> | — | — | <u>X</u> |
| 2. An increase in projected traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system?
<i>See P.1. A traffic control plan will be implemented during construction.</i> | — | — | <u>X</u> |
| 3. An increased demand for off-site parking?
<i>Project would not require parking.</i> | — | — | <u>X</u> |
| 4. Effects on existing parking?
<i>See P.3.</i> | — | — | <u>X</u> |
| 5. Substantial impact upon existing or planned transportation systems?
<i>See P.3.</i> | — | — | <u>X</u> |
| 6. Alterations to present circulation movements including effects on existing public access to beaches, parks, or other open space areas?
<i>See P.1.</i> | — | — | <u>X</u> |
| 7. Increase in traffic hazards for motor vehicles, bicyclists or pedestrians due to a proposed, non-standard design feature (e.g., poor sight distance or driveway onto an access-restricted roadway)? | — | — | <u>X</u> |

See P.1.

- | | | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|----------|
| 8. A conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation models (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? | — | — | <u>X</u> |
| <i>The development would be in conformance with above-mentioned policies, plans, and/or programs.</i> | | | |

Q. UTILITIES

Would the proposal result in a need for new systems, or require substantial alterations to existing utilities, including:

- | | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|----------|
| 1. Natural gas?
<i>Services are adequate for the proposed development.</i> | — | — | <u>X</u> |
| 2. Communications systems?
<i>See Q.1. The project would provide a communication facility for the area.</i> | — | — | <u>X</u> |
| 3. Water?
<i>See Q.1.</i> | — | — | <u>X</u> |
| 4. Sewer?
<i>See Q.1.</i> | — | — | <u>X</u> |
| 5. Storm water drainage?
<i>See Q.1.</i> | — | — | <u>X</u> |
| 6. Solid waste disposal?
<i>See Q.1.</i> | — | — | <u>X</u> |

R. WATER CONSERVATION

Would the proposal result in:

- | | | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|----------|
| 1. Use of excessive amounts of water?
<i>Services are adequate for the proposed development.</i> | — | — | <u>X</u> |
| 2. Landscaping which is predominantly non-drought resistant vegetation?
<i>Project would not propose any landscaping.</i> | — | — | <u>X</u> |

S. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:

1. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or

- | | | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|----------|---------------------|
| <p>endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?
 <i>No substantial change.</i></p> | <p>—</p> | <p>—</p> | <p><u> X </u></p> |
| <p>2. Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals? (A short-term impact on the environment is one which occurs in a relatively brief, definitive period of time while long-term impacts would endure well into the future.)
 <i>No such impacts have been identified.</i></p> | <p>—</p> | <p>—</p> | <p><u> X </u></p> |
| <p>3. Does the project have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (A project may impact on two or more separate resources where the impact on each resource is relatively small, but where the effect of the total of those impacts on the environment is significant.)
 <i>No such cumulative impacts have been identified.</i></p> | <p>—</p> | <p>—</p> | <p><u> X </u></p> |
| <p>4. Does the project have environmental effects which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?
 <i>No such impacts have been identified.</i></p> | <p>—</p> | <p>—</p> | <p><u> X </u></p> |

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

REFERENCES

A. Aesthetics / Neighborhood Character

 X City of San Diego Progress Guide and General Plan.

 X Community Plan.

_____ Site Specific Report:

B. Agricultural Resources / Natural Resources / Mineral Resources

 X City of San Diego Progress Guide and General Plan.

_____ U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey - San Diego Area, California, Part I and II, 1973.

_____ California Department of Conservation - Division of Mines and Geology, Mineral Land Classification.

_____ Division of Mines and Geology, Special Report 153 - Significant Resources Maps.

C. Air

_____ California Clean Air Act Guidelines (Indirect Source Control Programs) 1990.

 X Regional Air Quality Strategies (RAQS) - APCD.

_____ Site Specific Report:

D. Biology

 X City of San Diego, Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP), Subarea Plan, 1997

 X City of San Diego, MSCP, "Vegetation Communities with Sensitive Species and Vernal Pools" maps, 1996.

 X City of San Diego, MSCP, "Multiple Habitat Planning Area" maps, 1997.

_____ Community Plan - Resource Element.

_____ California Department of Fish and Game, California Natural Diversity Database, "State and Federally-listed Endangered, Threatened, and Rare Plants of California," January 2001.

_____ California Department of Fish & Game, California Natural Diversity Database, "State and Federally-listed Endangered and Threatened Animals of California," January 2001.

 X City of San Diego Land Development Code Biology Guidelines.

_____ Site Specific Report:

E. Energy (N/A)

F. Geology/Soils

 X City of San Diego Seismic Safety Study.

_____ U.S. Department of Agriculture Soil Survey - San Diego Area, California, Part I and II, December 1973 and Part III, 1975.

_____ Site Specific Report:

G. Historical Resources

 X City of San Diego Historical Resources Guidelines.

_____ City of San Diego Archaeology Library.

_____ City of San Diego Historical Inventory of Historical Architects, Structures, and People in San Diego (*July 2000*)

 X Historical Resources Board List.

_____ Community Historical Survey:

_____ Site Specific Report:

H. Human Health / Public Safety / Hazardous Materials

 X San Diego County Hazardous Materials Environmental Assessment Listing, 1996.

 X San Diego County Hazardous Materials Management Division

_____ FAA Determination

_____ State Assessment and Mitigation, Unauthorized Release Listing, Public Use Authorized 1995.

_____ Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan.

_____ City of San Diego Landscape Standards.

I. Hydrology/Water Quality

 X Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM).

_____ Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), National Flood Insurance Program - Flood Boundary and Floodway Map.

_____ Clean Water Act Section 303(b) list, dated May 19, 1999,
http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/tmdl/303d_lists.html).

J. Land Use

- ☒ City of San Diego Progress Guide and General Plan.
- ☒ Community Plan.
- ☒ Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan
- ☒ City of San Diego Zoning Maps
- _____ FAA Determination
- ☒ City of San Diego, Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP), Subarea Plan, 1997

K. Noise

- ☒ Community Plan
- _____ San Diego International Airport - Lindbergh Field CNEL Maps.
- ☒ Brown Field Airport Master Plan CNEL Maps.
- _____ Marine Corps Air Station (MCAS) Miramar CNEL Maps.
- ☒ San Diego Association of Governments - San Diego Regional Average Weekday Traffic Volumes.
- ☒ San Diego Metropolitan Area Average Weekday Traffic Volume Maps, SANDAG.
- ☒ City of San Diego Progress Guide and General Plan.
- ☒ Site Specific Report: *Noise Planning for Sprint PCS ROW Vault Containment System* (Eilar Associates, February 15, 2005)

L. Paleontological Resources

- ☒ City of San Diego Paleontological Guidelines.
- ☒ Thomas A., and Stephen L. Walsh, "Paleontological Resources City of San Diego," Department of Paleontology San Diego Natural History Museum, 1996.
- ☒ Kennedy, Michael P., and Gary L. Peterson, "Geology of the San Diego Metropolitan Area, California. Del Mar, La Jolla, Point Loma, La Mesa, Poway, and SW 1/4 Escondido 7 ½ Minute Quadrangles," California Division of Mines and Geology Bulletin 200, Sacramento, 1975.
- ☒ Kennedy, Michael P., and Siang S. Tan, "Geology of National City, Imperial Beach and Otay Mesa Quadrangles, Southern San Diego Metropolitan Area, California," Map Sheet 29, 1977.

M. Population / Housing

☒ City of San Diego Progress Guide and General Plan.

☒ Community Plan.

☐ Series 8 Population Forecasts, SANDAG.

N. Public Services (N/A)

☒ City of San Diego Progress Guide and General Plan.

☒ Community Plan.

O. Recreational Resources

☒ City of San Diego Progress Guide and General Plan.

☒ Community Plan.

☐ Department of Park and Recreation

☐ City of San Diego - San Diego Regional Bicycling Map

P. Transportation / Circulation

☒ City of San Diego Progress Guide and General Plan.

☒ Community Plan.

☒ San Diego Metropolitan Area Average Weekday Traffic Volume Maps, SANDAG.

☒ San Diego Region Weekday Traffic Volumes, SANDAG.

☐ Caltrans Project Report (1989)

Q. Utilities (N/A)

☐

R. Water Conservation

☐ City of San Diego Landscape Standards, December 1997.

☐ Sunset Magazine, New Western Garden Book. Rev. ed. Menlo Park, CA: Sunset Magazine.